DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 006 HE 006 845

TITLE	State Government-University Relations in the South.
INSTITUTION	Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 75
NOTE	36p.; Proceedings of a Conference on the Academic Community as a Backup Force to State Government (Atlanta, Georgia, May 5-6, 1975)
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization; *Higher Education; *Institutional Role; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Participation; Research and Development Centers; School Responsibility; *State Agencies; State Government; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	United States (South)

ABSTRACT

State governments need to be more innovative in providing various public services. Greatly increased state investment in public universities has strengthened university capabilities in many disciplines and research programs related to problems facing governments. But the real problems are involved in a university's efforts to provide more effective service to state governments. These problems include inappropriate organizational structures within universities, unfavorable past experiences in providing services, and widely varying perceptions of the university's total range of functions. While there is considerable consensus about the nature of state government university problems, there is much diversity in the manner of solution. Mississippi has established a single research and development center; Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas have established special centers or institutes; and Kentucky has often relied on faculty participation in task force efforts by state governments. After a comprehensive picture of the ways in which state government and university spokesmen view the public service responsibilities of higher education, it is concluded that a close and effective cooperation between a state agency and the universities can be a productive and continuing force. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED114006

State Government-University Relations in the South

Proceedings of a Conference on the Academic Community as a Backup Force to State Government

Atlanta Townehouse Motor Inn
Atlanta, Georgia
May 5-6, 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Southern Regional Education Board

State Government-University Relations in the South

Proceedings of a Conference on the Academic Community as a Backup Force to State Government

Atlanta Townehouse Motor Inn
Atlanta, Georgia
May 5-6, 1975

National Institute of Education
DHEW
AUG 7 1975
Educational Research Library

Southern Regional Education Board
130 Sixth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313

$1.00

3

This report deals with a study conducted with the support of National Science Foundation Grant No. GI-37858. Opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Foreword

The Conference on the Academic Community as a Backup Force to State Government on May 5-6, 1975 centered attention on an SREB study of state government-university relations which was funded by the National Science Foundation under its program of Research Applied to National Needs.

That study developed out of a growing Board concern about several points. One was that state governments need to be more innovative in providing various public services. It was known that greatly increased state investment in public universities has strengthened university capabilities in many disciplines and in research programs related to problems facing state governments. But there was also mutual awareness that real problems are involved in the universities' efforts to provide more effective service to state government. These include inappropriate organizational structure within universities, unfavorable past experiences in providing services and widely varying perceptions of the university's total range of functions.

The SREB study which was designed to cope with these problems has provided a comprehensive picture of the ways in which state government and university spokesmen view the public service responsibilities of higher education. The Atlanta conference of May 5-6 was planned and organized under the assumption that the partnership of state government and the universities flourishes or falters in accordance with the level of interest and concern which leaders in government and the university concentrate upon making that partnership a success.

Three groups were invited to attend the meeting: first, a limited number of public universities from each of the 14 SREB states was asked for representation; second, each governor was asked for representation from the executive or legislative branches of government, and third, each state higher education agency was invited.

The panel discussion which opened the Conference was a stimulus to vigorous discussion by those participants. Close and effective cooperation between a state agency and the universities can be a productive and continuing force, a point that is illustrated in the observations by George Beto of Texas. Earl Starnes provides insights into the experiences of a more recently emerging relationship between a university system and state agencies in the state of Florida.

There is considerable consensus about the nature of state government-university problems but much diversity in manner of solution. The resume of the group discussions indicates several approaches: Mississippi has established a single research and development center; Georgia, North

Carolina, Tennessee and Texas have established special centers or institutes; and Kentucky has often relied on faculty participation in task force efforts by state governments. This diversity is not surprising; each state ultimately needs to discover its own remedies. The Board is hopeful that mutual discussion will reduce the number of times "the wheel must be reinvented."

As states and universities look more closely at their interrelations, SREB will continue to solicit information on procedure and practice which is found effective for given states in given situations. The Board in turn will work to facilitate the sharing of information and experience, as well as to promote active cooperation in application.

Winfred L. Godwin
President
Southern Regional Education Board

Contents

iii	FOREWORD
1	THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY AS A BACKUP FORCE TO STATE GOVERNMENT Gene A. Bramlett
	REACTIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS:
9	A STATE UNIVERSITY PERSPECTIVE C. Brice Ratchford
13	A STATE AGENCY PERSPECTIVE Earl M. Starnes
17	LESSONS IN STATE AGENCY–UNIVERSITY COOPERATION George Beto
21	RESUME OF THREE CONCURRENT GROUP DISCUSSIONS
29	ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

The Academic Community as a Backup Force to State Government

Gene A. Bramlett

Most observers agree that state governments today are being confronted with new and more complex responsibilities. Both technical and policy issues are involved in decisions for better transportation systems, environmental protection, law enforcement, public health, education, regulatory functions, economic development, public finance, and many other areas. As a consequence, great strain is being felt at all levels of state government as state officials struggle to quickly assimilate the knowledge required to formulate just decisions in the public interest.

In view of the growing demands on state government, it is frequently suggested that local universities and colleges can and should provide more backup services to their state governments. After all, institutions of higher education often contain the largest pool of diversified talent anywhere in the state. Perhaps some of those resources could be tapped occasionally to assist state government. Moreover, the public universities and colleges are creations of state government, with some 60 percent or more of their budgets provided directly by the state legislature. Does it not follow that state universities and colleges should be willing to provide a minimum of services, at least, to their state governments?

Others have pointed out that in some states local universities have been providing a variety of services to their state governments for many years, apparently to the satisfaction of both groups. And in several instances working relationships have evolved to the point of well organized and well funded programs operated on a continuing basis. If some states have overcome the obstacles, why can't others?

Persons who are well acquainted with the broad range of issues involved, however, generally agree that effective working relationships between state governments and the academic community are difficult to achieve and maintain. Many practical and philosophical obstacles are involved, some real and some imaginary. The two groups are too different in terms of their traditional roles and organizational structures to expect them to develop mutually satisfactory working arrangements unless deliberate, positive actions are taken.

It was within this general context of the problem that the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) and the Research Applied to National Needs (RANN) directorate of the National Science Foundation decided last year to study the issues present in a 14-state region of the South. The

Dr. Gene A. Bramlett is Assistant Vice President for Services, and Associate Professor of Economics, University of Georgia. He was principal investigator and author of the study here described: *The Academic Community: A Backup Force to State Government* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1974).

states included were Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

The general purpose of the study was to determine how the resources of the academic community in the region could be used more effectively as a backup resource to state governments. The study was designed to determine what kinds of services universities and colleges in the region now are providing to their state governments. What types of institutions are providing them? What are their competencies and limitations? Are state governments satisfied with the quantity and quality of services they are now receiving? What kinds of services do state governments need? What specific obstacles are inhibiting the development of closer working relationships between state governments and the academic community, and how can they be overcome?

The study was undertaken with the hope that the results would stimulate officials of both state governments and the academic community to take positive steps to further develop mutually beneficial working relationships.

INFORMATION SOURCES

The university/college data were obtained by mailing a questionnaire to 84 colleges and universities in the 14-state region. These included 59 publicly-supported doctoral degree-granting institutions, 19 predominantly black institutions having graduate degree programs of some type, and six private doctoral degree-granting universities.

Sixty-one of the 84 universities and colleges surveyed completed the questionnaires in a usable manner and returned them to SREB—a response rate of nearly 73 percent. A similar questionnaire was mailed to 224 units of state government in the region. Of this number, 185 questionnaires were completed and returned to SREB—a response rate of over 83 percent.

In addition to the questionnaires, personal interviews were conducted with officials of 42 units of state government and 48 universities and colleges in the region. Also, six major universities located *outside* the region were studied to gain additional perspective in interpreting conditions and attitudes in the study region. These were the University of Missouri, Michigan State University, the University of Utah, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of California (Berkeley).

EXTENT OF INVOLVEMENT

The current extent of involvement between academic institutions and state governments in the region turned out to be much greater than was anticipated at the outset of the study. The public service budgets *for all purposes* of 37 institutions reporting these data totaled about $200 million in 1972-73—about $14 million per state. Although this figure is incomplete, practically all of the large public universities in the region reported these data. Thus, the actual figure is probably not much greater than the estimate.

The amount of work conducted specifically *for state government* totaled about $33 million, mostly in the form of contracts and grants. This figure, too, is probably underestimated due to "free" services provided to state governments, underreporting, and freelance consulting work by university/college faculty which was not included in their public service budgets.

About three out of four of the units of state governments studied indicated that they had requested some type of service from a local university or college during the past year, and a majority were "satisfied" (but not "highly satisfied") with the response.

The land grant universities and the large public universities in the region are the main types working with state governments. Smaller schools, predominantly black schools, and private universities are generally less involved.

Many of the larger universities have specially organized public service units to provide services to state governments and other outside groups. Some of these are supported by sizable budgets provided either by the principal users of the services or directly by the institution from state appropriations.

NEEDS OF STATE GOVERNMENT

The needs of state government for university/college assistance vary widely. Although the subjects of need tend to correspond with the principal function of the agency, the types of services needed include special studies, consultative services, technical problem-solving, and educational/training services. The most frequent problems mentioned by officials of state government were environmental concerns, long-range energy policies and programs, and priority planning or comprehensive growth policies.

Interestingly, these problems involve complex, multi-disciplinary issues. They are somewhat new to state government and do not fit well into established old-line agencies. As a consequence, they are frustrating to deal with, which might explain why they were so frequently cited as issues on which the academic community could provide assistance.

Other needs frequently cited by state government included financing, taxing, and budgeting problems; many kinds of training and educational activities; governmental reorganizational problems; assistance in many kinds of long-range planning problems; assistance in specific technical areas such as computer applications; general data and information needs; and many specific intermediate needs such as population projections needed for making decisions over a broad range of governmental concerns.

ADEQUACY OF PAST SERVICES

Overall, most agencies of state government reported that they were "satisfied" with the quality of services they have been receiving from local universities or colleges. They generally believe that when services are unsatisfactory, it is due in part to the nature of the problems and operating procedures of state government (i.e., not the fault of the university personnel providing the service), and in part to the organizational structure and nature of resources at the university level (in which case the university may or may not be at fault).

Officials of state government believe that university/college strengths are greatest in educational and training activities, e.g., the provision of off-campus instruction to government employees. They also believe that university personnel are competent in technical areas corresponding with their fields of training, and that they can provide valuable assistance on technical matters either through direct consulting or formal studies.

Some officials of state government, however, reported unfavorable experiences in working with university/college faculty. In varying degrees

of forcefulness, agency representatives used the following expressions to describe their dissatisfaction with university personnel: "ivory-tower thinkers," "impractical," "too theory-oriented," "too slow or unresponsive," "self-serving," "mercenary," and "don't understand state government."

On the other hand, a few university/college officials believe that state government is a hard group to work with because "they too often want free services," "they want services or results too quickly," "fail to properly define what they want," "spend too much time on 'band aid' approaches rather than solving fundamental problems," or "want to use university faculty for legwork or on mundane tasks."

It is emphasized, however, that forceful criticisms by both groups of the other were the exception, not the rule. The vast majority of officials of both state government and universities and colleges indicated that they are reasonably satisfied with the outcome of past working arrangements. More importantly, both agency and university/college officials expressed a belief that future working relationships can be improved with reasonable efforts on the part of both.

OBSTACLES

Much effort was expended in identifying specific obstacles that tend to inhibit closer working relationships between state government and the academic community. The premise, of course, was that if the real obstacles could be clearly identified, perhaps they could be resolved.

Program or policy limitations

A major type of obstacle to closer working relationships stems from inherent differences in the organization structure, mission, or personnel characteristics of both universities and state agencies. To illustrate, an agency respondent explained that his staff was simply too busy working on urgent matters of the agency to stop long enough to define a specific problem on which a university team might work. Others said they lacked time to effect arrangements or to adequately monitor work in progress. Similarly, a university official said that all his faculty members were fully committed to teaching and research. Consequently, they could not release someone from their regular responsibilities to help state government without several months' prior notice.

Inadequate funding arrangements

One of the major obstacles to closer working relationships is the lack of explicit provision for funding worthy projects. Officials of state government often feel that part of the large amount of state funds appropriated to public universities each year could be used to provide services to state government. Officials of universities and colleges, however, point out that virtually all of the money appropriated by the state legislature is justified by and designated for teaching and academic research. In most cases it would be illegal or unethical, at least, to expend the funds for any other purpose. Similarly, units of state government often operate under stringent fiscal regulations which, as a practical matter, prohibit them from paying for unscheduled services that might be needed during the budget year.

Under extreme circumstances of need, either the academic institution or the unit of state government affected can usually find a legal way to pay for a special project. But such arrangements are usually inadequate

on a routine basis. Moreover, some universities have developed regular funding procedures with specific units of state government. In those cases, either the state agency or a university anticipated the need and were successful in budgeting funds for that purpose. In many instances, however, the matter is not raised until it is too late to do anything about it.

Antagonistic attitudes

A different type of obstacle is that based on antagonistic attitudes either on the part of state government officials about university/college faculty or vice versa. Whether such attitudes are well grounded or merely misunderstandings, they comprise a type of obstacle which is not easy to overcome.

For various reasons, agency officials sometimes feel intimidated by university faculty. Some agency officials distrust the motives of university faculty who offer their services to state agencies. Others feel no need for outside assistance, believing they are adequately staffed, or that university personnel are not sufficiently skilled or oriented to their type of activity to be helpful.

From the viewpoint of the academic community, some university officials and faculty resent being asked to do "quick and dirty" projects for which they later will be held responsible for inadequacies. Others fear that the good name of the institution might be used by officials of state government to accomplish purposes which are not in the best interest of themselves or the public.

Again, truly antagonistic attitudes are relatively rare. In the vast majority of cases, the breach of distrust is not too wide to be bridged with reasonable efforts.

Communication

Another major obstacle to successful working relationships is the lack of personal contact or association between members of the academic community and state government. While it may be helpful for universities and colleges to prepare brochures describing services available, inventories of expertise, and addresses of contact points, most experienced observers agree that such procedures are inadequate. There is no substitute for periodic person-to-person contact to learn the needs of state government and the capabilities of the institution. Direct contact is also essential to the development of mutual trust between the potential users and suppliers of services.

Limitations

Undoubtedly, universities and colleges can provide valuable backup support to state governments. But they have definite limitations. They should not, for example, attempt to operate programs on a continuing basis or accept responsibility for making policy or program decisions. These roles rightly belong to state government and should not be delegated to an outside group. Moreover, when attempting to develop service programs, universities and colleges should build on their strengths, i.e., on those areas where they have outstanding capabilities. Also, only those faculty members who have both the technical knowledge and a propensity for working effectively with outside groups should be encouraged to do so.

Other obstacles

Somewhat surprisingly, there appears to be little fear of political entanglements that might result from working relationships between state government and the academic community. Similarly, no serious philosophical objections were expressed either by officials of state government or academic institutions; only practical issues seem to be involved.

A number of university/college officials, however, indicated that a substantial number of their faculty members were opposed to public service work either as a matter of principle or because public service activities are poorly rewarded at their institutions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of variations among states--the historical pattern of relationships, unique personalities, effectiveness of present working arrangements, and variations in state laws—no single set of recommendations applies in all circumstances. Nevertheless the following ideas may warrant consideration.

First, in most states of the region, no group is explicitly charged with the responsibility of identifying local obstacles, working out solutions and otherwise paving the way for productive relationships to develop between state government and the academic community. Consequently, many of the obvious corrective actions that might be taken are never acted upon. Consideration should be given to the formulation of a coordinating council to serve as a facilitator or harmonizer between the two groups. Such a council might be initiated by the Governor and include representatives of both state government and the academic community. The council should not attempt to "coordinate" the working relationships between state government and the academic units; rather it should attempt to create the conditions under which effective working relationships could flourish.

Second, it is suggested that state agencies reassess their needs for outside assistance and the potential for drawing upon the resources of the academic community for assistance. The primary objective would be for individual units of state government to identify those areas of agency functions where universities or colleges could be helpful over a period of several years.

Third, appropriate committees of the state legislature should explore alternatives for funding projects conducted by local universities and colleges for units of state government. It is suggested that funds be placed with operating units of state government to enable them to pay for services obtained from universities or colleges. Consideration should also be given to the provision of funds to universities or colleges for the express purpose of providing services to state government, including the state legislature, where it is anticipated that such services will be provided on a continuing basis. In many instances, such funds would enable the academic community to organize effective public service units with the capability of responding quickly to particular needs.

Fourth, states having central boards of higher education should encourage institutions under their jurisdiction to provide services to state government when it is appropriate to do so. In most organizations, commitment to a mission or function begins at the top of the administrative hierarchy. An action taken in several states to develop public service capabil-

ities has been to appoint a central coordinator of public service activities, e.g., a vice chancellor (or vice president) for public service.

Fifth, a number of actions can be taken by individual universities and colleges to encourage effective participation of the institution in public service activities. Briefly, each institution should reexamine not only its commitment to public service but also its organizational capabilities to respond quickly and effectively to requests for assistance. If possible, develop one unit with a multi-disciplinary capability to serve state government and other outside groups. Provide for a minimum, at least, of basic funding for public service activities. Appoint an overall administrator to plan and develop the public service program. Build on the strengths of the institution and involve individuals who are both technically competent and capable of working effectively with outside groups.

Finally, reexamine existing rewards systems to ensure that faculty engaged full-time or part-time in public service activities are amply rewarded for excellent performance. If significant discrepancies are found, develop measurable performance standards for public service faculty which are commensurate with standards applied to faculty engaged in resident instruction and academic research.

CONCLUSIONS

It is sometimes said that universities and colleges cannot be all things to all people. While this is literally true, it does not follow that their talents should be applied exclusively to resident instruction and academic research. Although these are the traditional missions of academic institutions, some of their faculty members can provide valuable services to state government. True, there are many obstacles to the establishment of successful working relationships, particularly the problem of suitable financing. But where there is strong commitment to work together, appropriate ways can usually be found to overcome the major obstacles. The fact that some universities are presently serving their state governments in mutually satisfactory ways suggests that others can also succeed if they are willing to try.

POSTSCRIPT

Since this study was completed, considerable interest has developed in the creation of some kind of federal program as an incentive to universities and colleges to provide more services to state and local governments. Presently, representatives of the National Science Foundation and the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges are exploring the possibilities.

Several points have been made in favor of federal support of university-based public service programs. First, a severe imbalance presently exists nationally between expenditures on research as a means of discovering new knowledge and expenditures on the utilization of research results to ensure that it is put to good use. Some $11 billion are spent annually in the United States on research and development activities and relatively little on the transfer of knowledge or its application by potential users.

Second, the potential benefits of organized public service programs for state and local governments is well established. Numerous study reports (including the present one), conference proceedings, study commission as well as the limited number of programs now in operation, lead to the conclusion that the concept is both technically and philosophically sound.

Third, a program similar to that under consideration has been operated nationally for many years—the Cooperative Extension Service. Although this program is focused primarily on agriculture, youth work, and home economics, its value to the nation has been demonstrated time and again. Thus, a successful model exists to provide guidance, at least, in formulating a suitable program directed to state and local government.

Fourth, neither the universities or state and local governments are likely to provide the amount of funds, on a sustained basis, needed to enable institutions of higher education to develop efficient public service delivery systems capable of tapping the full range of their resources. In the absence of a federal incentive program to help develop and sustain organized efforts toward this end, progress will be slow and spotty. With federal support, it is likely that a combination of federal, state, and local monies can be obtained in support of such organized efforts.

Perhaps the major question that remains is how should such a program be structured? What should be the program design? I leave you with the question: what key features do you think should be built into the program design of a federal program intended to increase the flow of useful services from the academic community to state and local governments?

A State University Perspective

C. Brice Ratchford

Dr. Bramlett has made an exceptionally fine study. It covers essentially every significant point on how the academic community can be a more significant "backup" force to state government. Since I am in general agreement, my remarks will serve to emphasize some of his conclusions and recommendations.

The academic community is the largest single knowledge base in the nation. In its faculty, staff, students, laboratory, computer and library facilities, there are resources that cannot be duplicated with any amount of money. If one accepts the principle that facts and ideas do improve decision-making, then this very large resource should be used by state government in its diverse and complex operations.

A great deal of help is being given in every state by the academic community to state government. This is particularly true of the public state land-grant institutions. It is often provided, however, in an unorganized way and may not be reported to top officials in either state government or the university. From my experience in both North Carolina and Missouri, I continue to be amazed at the large number of faculty and students who are involved in so many diverse ways. The involvement becomes very noticeable when there is some administrative or legislative hearing, and faculty and students end up as expert witnesses for both sides. Incidentally, there is nothing wrong with this, but it does make for an interesting situation particularly for the administrators. This example may be the classic situation which illustrates that the university and state government are indeed different.

It would surely be helpful if there were more widespread understanding that state government's purpose is decision-making and action, often including enforcement, while the university is concerned with learning, inquiry and discussion. Every time such a conflicting situation arises, however, I cannot help but feel that better coordination and early communication would have resulted in a more productive effort and certainly would have generated less heat.

While there will continue to be differences due to the generic roles of state government and universities, they are becoming more alike. As state government upgrades its administrators and staff, the personnel in state government and universities are increasingly alike in terms of background and training. Both make widespread use of computers and sophisticated

---

Dr. Ratchford is President, the University of Missouri, one of the non-SREB state universities which was studied under the project "The Academic Community: A Backup Force to State Government."

operational approaches such as management by objective. The university has become much more involved, often in cooperation with state government, in enforcement of laws and regulations. A few of the recent issues are equal employment opportunity legislation, salary and wage administration, OSHA, human experimentation, radiation safety, and environmental impact studies.

There are many problems which are relatively new to both the state and the university, including concern for the environment, energy, and an economy of scarcity. These are interrelated. No one proposes to have all the answers. Further, since new territorial prerogatives are not established, these and other new, emerging problems are excellent places for further cooperation. While everyone must work to be sure that state government and universities continue to be different, they are nevertheless becoming more alike which should make cooperation easier.

I would like to suggest some policy questions to be addressed by state government and the academic community. The first concerns commitment. Most state governments and universities need a commitment to the proposition that value will derive from working together. This commitment needs to be made at the top level. I have served as an administrator long enough to know that the commitment to work together will not necessarily insure the desired result, but without such a commitment nothing will happen.

The second is an effort to coordinate within state government and within the university and between each. I am in general agreement with Dr. Bramlett's recommendations on this subject. Again from years of administrative experience, I must warn that one should not expect too much. There is no way to stop a state official from going to a faculty member he knows or vice versa. Indeed, perhaps when developing the coordination plan it should be recognized that such activity will happen and encourage it. A plan can be developed and made to work for major efforts. Perhaps, we should consider the informal lateral communications and activities as just pluses to the general plan.

While it does not fit necessarily under the heading of coordination, I cannot resist commenting on Dr. Bramlett's recommendation of the role of the state education agency or state coordinating board. I am not against such agencies playing a hand in coordination of university public service. I am pessimistic about results because of my years of hard work in trying to really coordinate public service within a single public university system. It is immensely harder to coordinate public service activities than degree offerings because, by its very nature, public service may occur any place at any time. Much of it is short range in nature. This flexibility is the genius of university public service, but it greatly increases coordination problems. Perhaps my calling attention to the difficulties means that someone should work harder at the job.

The third is reaching agreement on funding. Dr. Bramlett is wise in dwelling at some length on this subject. It is funding problems that create difficulties when one moves from philosophical to the operating problems. State agencies and the public universities are funded from the same sources—the citizen's tax dollars. Both should be concerned with service to the people and they are. Yet in most cases neither have sufficient funds to carry out their primary mission. Just where the funds are placed is secondary. They do need to be provided to either state agencies or the

university with the purpose agreed upon. Otherwise, there is a feeling on both sides that the other must have the money, but each knows for sure it does not.

Under the funding heading there are some difficult "nitty-gritty" questions which create problems, such as the charge for indirect costs, payment to the institution vis-a-vis the individual, differences in fringe benefits, budgeting procedures, and salary scales.

The fourth policy question is that an agreement should be reached on involvement; in these days when the equalitarian movement is strong, there is a tendency to involve all. I am not philosophically against this trend, but the capabilities of the institutions are different. Their missions are different. I refer to an early statement regarding state coordinating boards of higher education. I have about decided that their greatest achievement could be to establish very tight mission statements for each institution in all phases of its activities, and then see that the institutions stay within their missions. The greatest thing which can happen today in higher education is planned diversity—not homogeneity. Achieving this goal will take courage and must be done by state government.

The key to successful university public service is advance planning. Dr. Bramlett hit this hard and correctly so. A university in many, many ways gets locked into a calendar. It can be changed, but lead time is needed. There will always be emergencies, and people will respond to such a situation. If there is not advance planning and everything is an emergency, those who must do the work will eventually begin to lose interest in the activity.

Dr. Bramlett also emphasized the importance of establishing formal communication channels. These are not too important where there are long-standing relationships such as between the University Medical School and State Department of Health, the School of Social Work and the Department of Welfare. They are particularly important when new projects need to be undertaken.

There should be a realization that a long-range commitment and effort is needed. Both the state and university will exist essentially forever. A change in top administration in either the state or university does not cause drastic changes in anything basic, particularly for those who ultimately do the work in either the university or state government. Time is needed for a university to develop its capacity to help state government and for state government to respond. This prompts the observation that, in addition to the governor, legislative leaders, and university leaders reaching agreement, there should be a core composed of a group of state civil servants and faculty leaders who are also involved in the planning and developing the commitment.

In the long run state government and the universities are not as far apart as they appear on a given day. Both are created to serve the citizenry and they do so or disappear. Perhaps the most valuable area of cooperation could be in a series of very sophisticated seminars involving the leaders from both groups on general topics. Here the future could be probed. If the topic is not yet up for legislative or administrative decision, the subject can be discussed rationally and alternatives explored. Hopefully, out of such activities a long-range policy which is beneficial to all can rationally evolve.

A State Agency Perspective

Earl M. Starnes

In reviewing Bramlett's report I'll make some comments in general about its findings and perhaps share with you very briefly a program that has emerged in the last two or three years in Florida.

First, I think it's worth noting two of the tables of the report dealing with the universities' perceived needs of state agencies and the state agencies' perception of the facilities of the universities. Look, for instance, at the assistance needed from the university, as perceived by state agencies. Environmental problems dealing with land use, resource management, etc. were placed as the highest priority in needed assistance from the universities throughout the region by 19 percent of the state agencies responding. It's interesting to note that among the universities' needs of state governments for assistance in formulating state policies education ranked 42 percent, the highest priority.

Second in priority on the part of state agencies were comprehensive planning, growth, growth management policies, policies dealing with provision of urban services and so on in the states. Eighteen percent of the state agencies felt that formulation of state energy policies was an area in which the universities could assist. Balancing these areas against human resources, the universities responded that they could provide or they perceived the needs of state agencies for research at 25 percent.

Seven percent, as perceived by state agencies, viewed finances, budget preparation training, tax alternatives, etc. as areas where universities may help. Universities perceived state agency needs as economic development, ranking that 12 percent and third in their hierarchy. Comprehensive planning, growth policies, urban management, etc. ranked 18 percent among state agencies' perceived problems as related to perception of potential university assistance. In order to achieve a percentage rank at all for urban problems I summed justice, transportation, labor and governmental organization to total eight percent.

This is not just a review of percentages and the rankings on the part of the state agencies and the rankings on the part of the universities. I believe it points out a very basic problem and one that the report clearly recognizes. That is the problem of communication between the university system and state agencies. There is little question that the universities are the knowledge base for the nation and certainly of this region. Now, is the lack of communication a result of difference in time perception on the part of the university and the state agency? Are the state agencies concerned

---

Mr. Starnes is Director, Florida Division of State Planning.

mostly with the problems that are day-to-day and are the universities perceiving problems of the future? I don't know. I think perhaps this would be worthy of consideration in terms of advancing this particular research. Are state agencies not aware of the latent body of knowledge that is generated in the universities? Are problems of the future perhaps more clearly perceived by those of the universities than problems perceived at the level of state agencies and state government management?

A second point is research. The methods of comprehensive planning today are anachronisms the profession has gathered together in the last 20 or 30 years in planning. Methods dealing with comprehensive planning are not being addressed by the universities to the level that they should be as exhibited by state agency interest. The opportunity and need is there but little funding exists in this direction for the universities. Methods and training for comprehensive planning as well as the several aspects of environmental planning are in demand by state agencies. Theoretical research in transportation planning has been heavily funded by federal agencies through the years; therefore, there's a tremendous amount of advance in that area. But again, that is simply one of the functions with which comprehensive planning for the future deals. So there is a skew in that direction because of federal policies that were advanced in the mid 50's.

Universities have long worked hard in the field of applied research. Most state departments of transportation have a research arm lodged somewhere in the university system. Most departments of agriculture lean heavily in their policy formulation on the agricultural research that's ongoing in southern universities.

Let's look now at other issues. Agency reorganization was alluded to in the study report—state agency reorganization, local government reorganization. How do we look at the hierarchies of government? State agencies do perceive a need in this area.

One problem that state agencies have in dealing with universities is the discontinuity of personnel. We, for instance, in Florida have had for years a relationship with the Bureau of Economic Research at the University of Florida. There is continuity among the research directors; however, their assistants are graduate students who come and go. The methods change, accuracy of projections are affected, data collection changes, and we're never quite sure what kind of product we're getting out of the constant changing of personnel.

Occasionally, the relevance of research in the university system tends to lag. For instance, we continue to have a tremendous amount of research in our university system dealing with health, health planning, and delivery of health services—very little research, however, dealing with resources, energy, and matters of nature systems except in the last few months spurred by national crisis.

Unfortunately, universities tend to reflect the availability of federal dollars. Their research policies are obviously skewed because of the availability of these resources. The accessibility of the university systems to state agencies should be increased by greater communication and, if possible, by direction of research in the university toward more relevance to agency needs.

The report mentioned that now in the 70's we talk very little of urban problems in university research programs. Unfortunately, it also reveals little interest in the state agencies. I presume that somehow all of the

urban problems have disappeared because the national government has lost interest in urban problems. I think this is a problem that comes out of this business of following national research dollars. It's obvious to anyone who lives near, in, or ever passes through cities that urban problems have not disappeared in the last decade.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I'd like to review very quickly the business of state agency and university research that Florida has implemented within the last two years. In 1973-74, $1,300,000, alluded to by many people as the "mythical million," was set aside as a line item in the state university system budget for research for state agencies. In 1974-75, this amount remained $1,300,000 for state agency research. In this year, there were 41 projects: 11 dealt with energy; 11 with the environment and environmental concerns, resource management, land use management and that sort of thing; 3 with law enforcement; and 12 with measures of the state's economic condition.

The way this works can be described as follows. The state university system has been circulating, within the last few weeks, requests for research projects from state agencies. After being reviewed by state university system staff, a committee comprised of university system, legislative, and state agency representatives set priorities. The committee takes the entire list of projects and priorities in perceived needed areas of research. These projects are sent out to the units of the university system. The university unit that has the most potential or is known to the state university system to be the most capable of doing a selected kind of research then responds with a dollar amount and a research project design. Again there is another state university system staff screening. Within the constraints of whatever dollars will be available, the research projects are allocated to units of the state university system. Because it is a process with minimal experience, it is not possible to assess its value. We admit that $1,300,000 is fairly minimal and is not considered added funds, but redirected funds. However, it does complement ongoing research in the university supported by private, federal and in some cases other state dollars. So it is beginning to reveal a way in which we, the state agencies, can directly communicate with the university system.

In finalizing my comments I would generally say that the state universities in the South should be much more aggressive about formulating their own research programs as a foundation for promoting their research relationships to the state. State agencies, by and large, simply are not dominated by people who focus on the future. State agencies are usually run by directors and chiefs and all sorts of administrative people who handle the sometimes very tedious business of state governments. Unfortunately, they find themselves often in a bog of bureaucracy with very few residual energies left to take long looks to the future.

Lessons in State Agency-University Cooperation

George Beto

For many years I have viewed with interest and admiration the work of the Southern Regional Education Board. I speak today largely as a former administrator who has come from that "bog of bureaucracy" to which Mr. Starnes referred. For ten years I was Director of the Department of Corrections in Texas, which in that state involves the management of 14 prisons with 17,000 inmates on 105,000 acres of land and over 20 industries. We have a construction program which usually involves ten million dollars per biennium and an education program beginning with the illiteracy school and continuing through junior college.

I never would admit this when I was director of corrections: whenever a newspaper man would ask me—after the appropriation bill was passed—how I did it I'd tell him, "Well, I took the crumbs from the higher education table." Now that I am retired and can indulge in greater honesty, I say that the legislature was more than reasonably generous with Corrections in our state.

As far as cooperation with institutions of higher learning is concerned in my experience, three state institutions cooperated substantially with the Department of Corrections. I will refer to some specifics of that cooperation and then make some general comments on this report. I feel as strongly as my two predecessors about the value of cooperation between state agencies and higher learning.

One of the institutions which could cooperate with us because of our large agriculture program was Texas A&M University. We had, for instance, 35,000 acres in row crops every year and the success of that program was due in large degree to the cooperation which A&M University gave us in planning and in supervision. We ran about 20,000 head of cattle, and we decided to improve the breed gradually by developing an F_1 and F_2 cross. In the development of that 10-year program A&M University played a significant role.

We kept about 16,000 hogs in a continuing program. Anyone who knows anything about agriculture knows about hog disease. A&M University aided us in the development of a nationally recognized specific pathogen-free swine program.

They were also helpful in our veterinary medicine program because, with all that livestock, we had on our payroll—on the state payroll—one doctor of veterinary medicine. However, he was more than adequate when you

---

Dr. Beto is Distinguished Professor of Criminal Justice, Sam Houston University. He was formerly Director of Corrections for the state of Texas.

considered the help which A&M University gave us through the College of Veterinary Medicine. The only cost to us was the cost of the medicine and the transportation of the teachers and the senior vet students. The only problem I had incurred was when the late Earl Rudder—General Rudder, who was chancellor of A&M University—called me one day and said, "You got me in trouble again." I said, "What is the problem, General?" He replied, "You got a damn rule over there that says no women can participate in this vet medicine program—they cannot work among those convicts." I said, "Well, that is one of the problems that arises when you delegate too much." I was not aware of the rules. Some hireling of mine delegated that rule advising the head of the school of vet medicine that henceforth and forever female vet students cannot participate in the program. I said, "They are probably safer working among the convicts than they are among those A&M students anyway!"

They were also helpful to us in the construction of agricultural buildings like an abattoir; a cheese factory (for the first month an A&M professor ran the cheese factory after it began working); the scientific design of feed lots; and an offal disposal. I cannot speak too highly of the cooperation which A&M University very willingly and inexpensively gave us.

The University of Texas was also helpful; their help rested largely in the area of the Medical School. We sent and continue to send 75 to 150 convicts weekly to the Medical School for diagnosis or for specialized surgery and treatment. In addition to that, the Medical School developed a significant program in corrective surgery—plastic surgery—which was an elective process as far as the inmates were concerned.

I made a lot of mistakes when I was director but the most serious was contracting with the University of Texas, my old alma mater, to run management schools—one for the 14 wardens and another for the 14 assistant wardens. They were going to teach them the principles of management. They took them up there and indoctrinated them on the idea that they were executives, saying, "You men are executives. You're running complex operations." They instilled almost indelibly in the minds of a lot of those wardens the idea that they had to delegate. Fortunately, it didn't take with the older wardens. They were exposed to that virus but they went home and ran their institutions as they always did. But some of the younger ones believed that. I visited those units once a week, and I'd go into the warden's office and say, "Warden, how many men do you have in your junior college program this semester?" "Just a minute I'll call the education director," he would answer. I asked, "How many men do you have in solitary today?" That was an important item because we were constantly being litigated on it. "Just a minute I'll call the building captain." Or if it was an agricultural unit I'd ask him what his calf crop percentage was (we tried to hit a 90 percent calf crop). "Just a minute I'll call the ag supervisor." He was an executive; he had delegated all of that stuff. No prison unit was so large or so complex the warden couldn't know what was going on—and should know. That was one serious error I made. It took me a year to disabuse those young men of the idea that they were executives and that they had to delegate.

The greatest amount of research as far as corrections was concerned came from Sam Houston State University. A large part of that research has come and continues to come through student participation by way of master's theses. Sometime before I retired I set up a research section in the Department of Corrections. If I were reliving that part of my life, I

wouldn't set up a research department; I would have all of the research done by either Sam Houston State University or Texas A&M or the University of Texas—some educational institution. I would use them for a number of reasons: one, it's more economical, and two, research secured from an inhouse research section tends to appear somewhat less objective to people on the outside.

The universities were also helpful to us in the area of inservice training. Above all, they were extremely helpful in improving the educational qualifications of employees generally. I found out one day that there was nothing in the statutes that said a prison guard had to be 21 years old. There was no age limit—upper or lower. We had a Department policy as far as the upper age was concerned, but for years they had been hiring prison guards at the age of 21 and not below. When I found out there was no statute preventing me from lowering that age, I lowered it to 18. My argument was that if they're old enough to fight in Viet Nam, they're old enough to guard convicts. By the time of my retirement, we had 2,400 employees, 20 percent of whom were college students. They would work an 8-hour night shift and go to school during the day. It worked out very well. In fact, to use an expression that Mr. Nixon used in introducing his first cabinet, college students at that time brought, and continue to bring, a new dimension to the guarding of convicts.

Now, I'd like to make some general observations. I'd like to refer very briefly to the obstacles Dr. Bramlett mentioned. He says the first one is program or policy limitations. To me that's just a euphemism for inability or refusal to cut red tape. You get a lot more cooperation between state agencies and institutions of higher learning if the agency heads and the heads of institutions of higher learning are willing to cut red tape.

Lack of funds or inability to finance the work—to me that's not significant. I think those of us in state agencies and people in higher education tend to stress money too much. A lot more cooperation could be effective if there were just a little more creativity and a little more imagination. Too often when a problem is posed to higher education or to a state agency the immediate conclusion is, "If we could just get a grant to do this or, an additional appropriation. . . ." It doesn't always take money. It requires some imagination and creativity.

Then there are the attitudes which inhibit cooperation or interaction. I remember during John Connally's first term as governor of Texas he convened a meeting of all agency heads, all chairmen of boards, and representatives of the University of Texas—department heads and chancellors and vice chancellors. It was a two-day meeting to determine how the University of Texas could cooperate more fully with state agencies. The purpose of the meeting was extremely laudable and commendable, but it was just this one item that Dr. Bramlett lists here—the attitudes on both the parts of higher education and of agency heads indicated that that type of cooperation was inhibited.

Then there is the fear of political entanglements or repercussions. I think that generally agency heads tend to be, as someone has said, "vacillating and timorous" but I don't think that they need to have any fear of political entanglements or repercussions in cooperating with institutions of higher learning. My experience with state legislatures extends over a long period of time—beyond the period when I was director of corrections (I was also a member of the Board of Corrections). My experience with state legislators

is that leaders among the state legislature would welcome a higher degree of coopcration between institutions of higher learning and state agencies.

I have a final observation: This objective—this laudable objective which we're discussing—is going to be achieved, but it's going to be achieved only if leadership is exercised by the agency heads and by the heads of the state institutions of higher learning. There has to be a high degree of rapport between those two types if it's going to be effective. Secondly, I think the legislators of the states which we represent need to issue a mandate, not necessarily furnish money, but to indicate very clearly that they expect a high degree of cooperation between the agencies and institutions of higher learning. And finally, let's not emphasize money. Some money is necessary, but let's deemphasize money and emphasize rather imagination, creativity, and faith.

Resume of Concurrent Group Discussions

The following is a summary of opinions expressed by officials of state governments and universities and colleges during three concurrent group discussions. The summary is based on notes made by "reporters" in response to a series of questions posed by discussion leaders.

Is it practical to expect universities to provide more services to state government?

Participants in the three discussion groups generally agreed that universities and colleges in the 14-state region can provide useful services to state governments. One discussant observed that there is a growing trend toward university assistance to state government: "The real question is how, when, what, and where should universities provide services to state governments." Others maintained that while the need exists and universities have both the commitment and resources to enable them to respond to the need, many universities will have to make internal adjustments and obtain additional funds if they are to respond effectively.

One discussant pointed out that this does not mean that an undue portion of university resources will be devoted to assisting state governments. Teaching and research are still the principal activities of major universities and will continue to be. When we speak about more services to state government, we are talking about relatively small magnitudes in relation to the university's total scope of program. Services to state governments could be doubled or tripled above present levels without infringing upon the traditional missions of universities.

There was general agreement that many universities presently are not structured in ways to permit them to respond quickly to the needs of state government. One participant said that the universities will have to "gear-up" by establishing special service units to meet the needs of government, especially where interdisciplinary problems are involved. An official of state government observed: "We don't always know how to ask the right questions." Another said, "We don't know the person to contact for a specific need." A third, however, said if you don't know whom to contact, all you have to do is call the president and tell him, "I need a man," and help would be forthcoming.

Nevertheless, timing of requests and the degree of communication between the two groups are important both to state government and academic institutions. A discussant from government said a "middleman" is needed

through which contacts can be made. Another discussant called for a "window" into the university. Several discussants suggested that the strength of universities was in long-term studies which permit proper scheduling of activities. Others spoke about the strengths of universities in providing training services. The need for universities to maintain quality safeguards was also mentioned with the pointed warning that "a professor's mistakes are not soon forgotten."

Overall, the consensus both of state government and of university and college officials appeared to be that universities can be effective in assisting state government. Many are now. Basically, this is a sound idea provided agencies of state government communicate their needs to universities and provided the universities take steps to respond quickly and effectively.

How do conditions vary among the 14 states?

It was revealed that numerous variations exist among the states concerning the manner in which universities are trying to respond to state needs. In some states there are relatively few organized public service programs designed to respond to the needs of state government on a generalized or continuing basis. Instead, special arrangements often have to be worked out among individuals in the universities and state governments for a new project. In Kentucky, for example, some university faculty members participate in task force efforts by state government to help solve particular problems. One university spokesman, however, said that his institution is gradually establishing ongoing public service programs of a specific nature to assist state government on economics, labor, and drug abuse problems.

Mississippi has responded to the needs of state government by establishing a single research and development center under the general canopy of higher education. In addition to a permanent staff of the center, faculty members are brought in from time to time to supplement the regular staff.

In Florida a special fund has been established which is tied in with the universities, the state legislature, and the Board of Regents. Together they match requests for services of universities to the needs of state agencies and set priorities with regard to the use of the special fund.

Special centers and institutes exist in a number of states (e.g., Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee and Texas), some of which relate to a particular group in state government (e.g., providing legislative research services to the state legislature) or to a specific agency (e.g., labor, economic development, health, and revenue). There appear to be relatively few multidisciplinary centers or institutes capable of responding over a broad range of needs of state government on a regular or continuing basis. There is such a group in at least one state—Georgia: it is set up on a joint-staffed basis, with direct ties to numerous academic units in the university, is provided hard money funding, and has capabilities of serving state government over a broad range of concerns.

One discussant commented that university personnel in his state occasionally are appointed to special study committees of state government. Another said that many faculty have private consulting arrangements with units of state government and others occasionally consult without charge merely because they are interested.

University continuing education programs were cited as a type of program in many states which provide services to state government. In Georgia, for example, the University's continuing education program and its Institute of Government regularly provide educational services to numerous government employees.

In general, universities in the region appear to be providing many kinds of services to state government. The procedures vary, as does the degree of satisfaction of both universities and state governments. Moreover, a number of university discussants indicated that they are committed to providing services to state government and are working toward improved service delivery mechanisms.

What did the group think about the usefulness of a coordinating council?

Opinions varied widely concerning the utility of a coordinating council as a means of improving the quality of services to state government. Undoubtedly, the discussants interpreted the concept of a coordinating council in different ways. This was due in part to different images the word "coordinating" suggested and in part to concern for loss of flexibility in university-government programming. In the study report, a coordinating council was depicted as a "facilitator" or "harmonizer"—a means of assessing particular obstacles to better working relationships within a state and a mechanism for solving some of those problems. It was not intended to be a receiver, allocator, or coordinator of funds or programs.

Several officials of state government expressed the feeling that duplication of services can be a problem and felt that the universities ought to coordinate among themselves. Another said that there are too many coordinating councils already and asked why can't existing agencies (universities and state groups) take care of their own coordination?

Implicit in many of the comments was recognition that coordination is needed, but there was little agreement on how it could be achieved. One discussant observed that the coordinating council as outlined in the study report was only one strategy—not necessarily the best one for his state. He maintained that agencies which have funds budgeted for services from universities can coordinate their own work. Another discussant suggested that a "super-briefing" once a year, for the purpose of exchanging information on needs and capabilities, might be a satisfactory way of handling the problem.

Representatives from several states described their approach to coordination. Florida, for example, has an *ad hoc* group consisting of representatives from the state legislature, the Governor's office, and the Board of Regents. One of their functions is to match requests for services with the availability of resources. In Kentucky the legislature has a committee which considers the merits of proposals submitted for funding. Several states gave illustrations where certain specific activities (e.g., in Texas, urban problems) were coordinated by a central group but which did not consider the full range of problems affecting state government. One discussant maintained that coordination could be effected in specific subjects or functional areas but that a coordinating council could not function well across the board.

Few of the participants commented on the specific recommendation of the study report, i.e., the function of identifying local obstacles to better

working relationships between state government and universities and attempting to remove those obstacles. Overall, the comments reflected a resistance to central coordination, yet a recognition that problems exist and that something ought to be done. Generally, university representatives were less receptive to the idea of coordination than were state government representatives. But both were skeptical that the problem could be solved by a single central group.

Should state agencies be encouraged to reassess ways they can draw upon university resources to help solve problems?

One discussant observed that trying to get state agencies to reassess their needs was all well and good, but they will not do it unless there is a mandate by the Governor. Several persons suggested that the universities should work with state government in defining their needs. In this way, the university would gain a better understanding of state needs and, in the process, be able to identify the kinds of things they could and could not do.

Another said that the initiative for identifying problems on which universities might provide help lies with state government; they have to carry the ball. University people might work with them, but they can't do it for them. Contrary to this view, a person in another discussion group thought problem identification could be a legitimate project saying, "Get the university to assess the needs of state government and write up a report on it."

Another way of assessing state government needs might be via a special liaison person who would simultaneously identify needs and match them with resources available in the universities. Most agreed that assessing state needs would not be particularly beneficial unless there was also a means of pinpointing where the state universities could reasonably provide a service.

One discussant said that all this could be carried too far. If a large number of problems were identified and the universities used this as a basis for requesting more funding, there might be a "public relations backlash." The implication was that it might be better for state government to isolate one problem at a time for universities to work on and leave the rest to a later time.

One discussant suggested we ought to consider why state government has not asked the universities for help more often. Part of the answer may be that government agencies fear becoming over-dependent on outside groups, particularly on one university. As state governments grow and mature, they add more in-house specialists to their staffs. This is happening particularly in the legislative branch. This trend may reduce the needs of state government for university assistance. Another commented that there are always new areas where there is a shortage of in-house expertise. The nature of the needs may change, but there will always be a need.

Should more effective funding procedures be developed?

One discussant stated what appeared to be the general feeling of most conference participants when he said, "Money is a problem." Beyond this, however, viewpoints varied widely. A few university discussants asserted

that inadequate funding is a major reason for the relatively small amount of services they are providing to state government. Others indicated they had been fairly successful in getting money to provide services in specific areas of state government but not in others.

Likewise, differences were expressed concerning strategies designed to solve the problem. Some argued merely for greater flexibility in the use of existing funds while others suggested that money ought to be appropriated and placed in university budgets for the purpose of providing services.

At least one university participant expressed the opinion that state government ought to pay for any service requested—"put it on a pay-as-you-go basis." Consistent with this philosophy, several said that the funds ought to be placed in state agencies. If placed in the university budget, it might appear that the university has more money for educating students than it actually has for that purpose. Others, however, argued that at least part of any special funds to assist state government should be placed in the university budget to help build their capabilities. The discontinuous project-by-project approach doesn't allow universities to establish an effective service delivery system. Others, too, felt that administratively it was better to have a "center" to serve outside groups rather than make special arrangements for each project.

There was near unanimous agreement that overhead charges on contracts are a sensitive matter with state governments and that universities should not charge state government as high rates as they charge the federal government (audited overhead rates of 50 to 60 percent). One participant said he felt 15 to 20 percent of total cost of a contract with state government was about right. Another said that auditors are partly to blame; they want everything uniform—one rate—and that filters up (or down) and becomes policy. In some cases, the institution may not want to include any overhead to state government; in other instances, it might be perfectly acceptable, as in the case of federal agencies, to charge the full rate.

Concerning the possibility of federal funding, there was some disbelief that the federal government would fund any program on a continuing basis. With a few reservations, most felt that some kind of continuous or regular federal funding would be a great stimulus to universities to provide services to state government. Several felt that some matching contributions by in-state groups would be desirable. There was no consensus, however, on the matter of whether federal funds should be directed to institutions as a means of developing their capabilities or be allocated for specific projects. Another person expressed a concern that federal funds not be used as an excuse to reduce local funding.

One discussant maintained that it is important that universities achieve a "critical mass" in terms of their capabilities to provide services to state government. One-year grants—uncertain funding—are not adequate to do that. A five-year grant would provide more certainty, allowing the institution to develop an effective program. Even Title I of the Higher Education Act has not contributed significantly to university public service capabilities, although it has induced more universities to provide public services. One person suggested a trial period with regular federal funding. During the initial period the states could experiment to find out what kinds of arrangements seem to work best.

One person was opposed to federal funding on grounds that the state should pay for its own needs. Also, he suggested that there is already more federal money around than is being used. He maintained that when an

institution depends on federal money it is "living dangerously." If federal money is used, it should be used to build a constituency which in the long run will be willing to pay for the services it desires.

The consensus in one discussion group with regard to the possibility of federal funding of university services to state government was one of caution: Institutions should not become dependent on any federal program.

Should central boards of higher education add a person or two to encourage and help coordinate services to state government?

To a great extent, the responses to this question reflected differences in the organizational structure of higher education in the 14 states. Six states have central governing boards of higher education; the other eight have coordinating boards. Discussants from states with less powerful coordinating-type boards tended to be less convinced that a public service staff position in the board's central office would be useful. Several states, however, now have such positions and the representatives from those states tended to favor the idea.

One discussant said a high level public service position gave service activities "status" which they would not have otherwise. "It is important symbolically," he maintained, as well as providing a practical means for coordination.

Another view was that institutions in the state ought to compete in providing services to state government. Let the "customer" decide whom he wants to provide assistance. Another discussant was concerned that a high level position in a limited field like public service could become a czar. Yet, at the same time, such a person could help reduce unnecessary duplication.

What can universities do to improve their capabilities of serving state governments?

There was near unanimous agreement that a satisfactory way of financing services to state government is essential if services are, in fact, to be provided, but opinions varied with regard to how it should be done.

Opinions varied concerning whether a university needs a top level public service administrator. One discussant maintained that coordination should be at the working level—coordination by a top administrator takes too much time. Yet most agreed that it depends upon the size and scope of program. An institution deeply involved in public service activities may need a top administrator to "knock heads" and to provide the internal leadership for the public service program.

There was some discussion on the need for multidisciplinary service capabilities, e.g., a "center" or "program" capable of tapping the full range of institutional resources. One person said this was a "variable"—it depends on the institution and how it is organized. By inference from earlier comments, some discussants would prefer that individual projects be handled by appropriate academic units. One discussant, however, maintained that it makes sense administratively to have some kind of

center on campus to coordinate and oversee public service work. Otherwise, responsibility for service activities may get lost in the shuffle.

One discussant cited a general problem which he believes affects the ability of many universities to provide services to state government. The basic cadre of universities is the tenured professors. Under typical circumstances, they are fully engaged in teaching and research, with no time left over for assisting state government or any other outside group. Consequently, their services are not easily obtained. It is extremely difficult to match up just the right professor with a particular need of state government at the right time. Unless there is some mechanism for tapping appropriate resources at the time they are needed, the university may not be able to respond in a way to build rapport with state government.

Are the rewards systems for persons in public service activities adequate in relation to the rewards for teaching and research?

There was general agreement that the internal rewards systems within universities are quite complex and therefore difficult to analyze. For example, there is a problem of knowing how to evaluate the *quality* of service to outside groups. Techniques for evaluating the quality of teaching and research are much more standardized than for public service activities.

One person suggested that variations in rewards for research, teaching, and service tend to act as a negative incentive on faculty to engage in service work, but the consequences are obscure and vary among institutions. One discussant said that "engineering and agricultural extension workers should not be made to feel that they are second-class citizens; they should receive rewards for their work like any other faculty member." Another noted that the nature of the problem is different at the department level compared to the university level. In other words, faculty working out of a university-wide unit may experience fewer discrepancies than faculty in a given academic department.

Several agreed that public service faculty could often convert service project results into research publications—but not always. Another person raised the question: "Should there be a separate public service faculty?" Alternatively, should not all faculty be engaged in some kind of service? That might get around the incentive problem. One person suggested that rewards should be based on overall "productivity" rather than "scholarship" alone. If that were done, promotions and salary increases would be based on whether faculty members were productive in performing their assignments rather than whether they demonstrated scholarship.

Roster of Participants

STATE AND UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATIVES:

Dr. A. D. Albright
Executive Director
Commonwealth of Kentucky
Council on Public Higher Education
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dr. Claud Anderson
Education Coordinator
Office of the Governor
The State Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Ms. Sharon Beard
Assistant Director for Planning and Evaluation
State of Louisiana—Board of Regents
P. O. Box 44362—Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Dr. Frank L. Bentz, Jr.
Vice President for Agricultural Affairs and Legislative Relations
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

Mr. Staige D. Blackford
Assistant to the President
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Dr. Marion R. Blair
Associate Director of the Transportation Institute
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
Greensboro, North Carolina 27411

Mr. James R. Bradley, Director
Continuing Education and Engineering Extension Service
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843

Dr. Chester C. Carroll
Vice President for Research
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Dr. James H. Clotfelter, Jr.
Director
Center for Public Service
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas 79409

Dr. Lewis Cochran
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Professor O. B. Conaway
Benedum Professor of Government
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Dr. M. Olin Cook, Director
Department of Higher Education
401 National Old Line Building
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Dr. Wesley N. Dorn, Director
Maryland Council for Higher Education
93 Main Street
Annapolis, Maryland 31401

Mr. Barry N. Dorsey
Assistant Director for Planning
State Council of Higher Education
10th Floor, 911 E. Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Dr. John O. Eidson
Vice Chancellor
University System of Georgia
244 Washington Street, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Mr. Otis Floyd
Assistant to the Commissioner
Department of Education
Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

The Honorable Caroline E. Frederick
State Representative
326 Check Springs Road
Greenville, South Carolina 29609

Dr. Frederick O. Goddard
Associate Professor of Economics
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Dr. Harold P. Hanson
Vice President for Administrative Affairs
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Dr. Don Harrell
Office of the Governor
State Capitol
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Mr. Wilbur Hurt
Director of Community Services
Coordinating Board
Texas College and University System
P. O. Box 12788, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Mr. Sam H. Ingram, Commissioner
State Department of Education
Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Dr. E. Walton Jones
Associate Vice President of the University of North Carolina
P. O. Box 2866
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Dr. Frank Kinard
Assistant Commissioner for Research
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
Rutledge Building
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Mr. Roger Kirk
Executive Assistant to the Governor
P. O. Box 11450
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Dr. William F. Little
Vice Chancellor for Development and Public Service
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Dr. Steve A. Martin, Director
Governmental Services Institute
Division of Continuing Education
387 Pleasant Hall
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Dr. Robert H. McKenzie
Administrative Assistant
University of Alabama
University, Alabama 35486

Dr. Jim Meredith
Mississippi Research and Development Center
3825 Ridgewood Road
Jackson, Mississippi 39211

Dr. Ralph E. Nelson
Provost for Off-Campus Education
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Dr. Jim Peyton
Office of State Planning
State Capitol Building
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Mr. John Poerner, Executive Director
Governor's Committee on Aging
P. O. Box 12788
Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Dr. John R. Porter, Jr.
Executive Director
Alabama Commission on Higher Education
1504 Union Bank Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

Dr. T. J. Robinson
Assistant Vice President for University Relations
Jackson State University
Jackson, Mississippi 39219

Dr. Tim Ryles
Office of the Governor
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Dr. Charles E. Smith, Chancellor
The University of Tennessee at Nashville
10th and Charlotte
Nashville, Tennessee 37203

Dr. Jean E. Spencer
Associate Executive Director
State of Maryland—Board of Trustees of the State Colleges
Jeffrey Building
16 Francis Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

The Honorable James Stockley
State Representative
Box 35
Marion, Arkansas 72365

Dr. Robert H. Stoudemire
Director of the University's Bureau of Governmental Research and Research Service
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Dr. Thomas F. Stovall, Associate Director for Academic Affairs
Tennessee Higher Education Commission
908 Andrew Jackson State Office Bldg.
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Dr. Robert J. Terry
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas 77004

Dr. Barbara Teters, Head
Department of Political Science
Mississippi State University
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

Dr. Anne E. Thompson
Associate Dean of the Extension Division
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Dr. E. E. Thrash
Executive Secretary and Director
Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning
1855 Eastover Drive
P. O. Box 2336
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Dr. William L. Turner, Vice Chancellor
University Extension
North Carolina State University
P. O. Box 5125
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Dr. S. M. Willis
Dean of University Extension
Martin Hall
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

Dr. S. E. Younts
Vice President for Services
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION:

Dr. George W. Baker
Program Manager
Division of Advanced Environmental Research and Technology
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street
Washington, D. C. 20550

Mr. Louis D. Higgs
Office of Intergovernmental Science and Research Utilization
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street
Washington, D. C. 20550

PANEL:

Dr. George Beto
Distinguished Professor of Criminal Justice
Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77340

Dr. C. Brice Ratchford
President
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65201

Mr. Earl M. Starnes, Director
Division of State Planning
Department of Administration
IBM Building
660 Apalachee Parkway
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

STAFF, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA:

Dr. Frederick L. Bates
Department of Sociology

Dr. Gene A. Bramlett
Assistant Vice President for Services

Dr. Cameron L. Fincher, Director
Institute of Higher Education

Dr. Edwin L. Jackson
Institute of Government

Dr. Huey B. Long
Institute of Community and Area Development

Mr. Thomas W. Mahler, Director
Center for Continuing Education

STAFF, SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD:

Dr. Winfred L. Godwin, President

Dr. E. F. Schietinger, Director of Research

Ms. Ann Mather, Editorial Assistant

Ms. Vikki Brandt, Secretary

Ms. Ruth Gentry, Secretary